25 CENTS

Priest-craft

ROMAN and OTHER

BX
1767
H37
1899
GTU
Storage

Dean Hart

Priest-Craft

Roman and Other

BY

H. Martyn Hart, D.D.

Dean of St. John's Cathedral, Denver, Colorado

GRADUATE THEOLOGICAL UNION
LIBRARY
1962

Property of
CBSK
Please return to
Graduate Theological
Library

NEW YORK
THOMAS WHITTAKER
2 AND 3 BIBLE HOUSE

BX
1767
H37
1899

Copyright, 1899
By Thomas Whittaker

#14222316

+251

Preface

This little book purposes to present, in concise form:—

The motive energy of Sacerdotalism;
The natural history of Transubstantiation;
The bare statement of its logical conclusion;
The testing of the truth of its theory.
By an experimentum crucis.

A wider treatment of its results may be found in "England's Danger," by Dr. Horton; and in "The Secret History of the Oxford Movement," by Mr. Walsh; to both which works I express my obligations.

H. M. H.

THE DEANERY,
Denver, Colo., U. S. A.
Advent, 1899.

17878

Priest-Craft:—*Roman and Other*

I.

THE RISE OF THE DOCTRINE OF TRANSUBSTANTIATION.

"A priesthood that doth not pass to another."
R. V. margin. Hebrews vii. 24.

SACERDOTALISM, the vitality of the priestly caste, is an assumption that a certain set of men make, that in some special way they are the ministers of the Most High and by Him are invested with powers which ordinary men do not possess.

Every man's Self strives for predominance. Personal power is the aim of Self. This innate desire has produced in every nation a priestly class. The instinct to

pray is universal, and taking advantage of the desire, there have always been men who offered to direct prayer and ventured to assure the petitioner of a favorable reply, if the instructions they set forth were complied with.

These simple conditions account for the existence and the prestige of all priests, from the medicine man of the North American Indian—to His Holiness the Pope.

Now it is not to be supposed that all priesthood is of purely human production. Almighty God is not only the Creator, but He is the Preserver of all mankind. And inasmuch as He was pleased to put into the heart of men a desire to pray, so He vouchsafed to provide them with a revelation of how and to whom they were to pray. Cain satisfied the one condition but not the other, and was rejected because he did not pray aright.

What may suffice for the indi-

vidual and for society in its earliest stages, requires modification for a multitude. It pleased Almighty God therefore to set apart an order of men who might attend to the spiritual wants of the people.

To render the worship of a multitude possible, regulation was necessary; the earliest ritual was largely rules of order.

In New Testament times, the elaborate ritual of the five Sacrifices, having found their fulfilment in the Sacrifice of Calvary, sacrifice and oblation ceased; the rending of the vail intimated that the Holy of Holies was from henceforth open to all men; the Holy Spirit was poured out upon all flesh; and all believers became "priests unto God," offering "spiritual sacrifices."

It was still necessary that men should be set apart to give themselves to the ministry of the Word and to shepherd the sheep. The

apostles ordained Elders in every city, and in time the chairman of these elders became the Bishop. Christianity brought with it Charity, in a sense unknown to the heathen world; and deacons were ordained "to serve the tables" and look after the sick and needy. So, as in the old dispensation, the same evident division of work required the same officers; there must be a head; then came the men who were charged with the delivery of God's revelation, the priests who expressed it in the elaborate ritual of sacrifice; and when the Word came in its fulness, "the evangelists," who "were ambassadors for Christ"; and finally the levites in the old, the deacons in the new dispensation, who looked after the necessary secular detail of service. The threefold order of the ministry is the outgrowth of evident requirement. But as soon as we pass into the New Testament we

are aware of a most significant change. Sacrifice has gone and with it the sacrificing Priest.

There are ten terms in the New Testament used to describe the gospel ministers, but the one word of the Old Testament, ἱερεὺς, the sacrificing priest, is carefully eschewed, it is not once used. The most noted of the Apostles declares himself to be, "less than the least of all saints"; he works with his hands that he may be chargeable to none; he withstands the chief apostle, him to whom they say the Lord Himself gave the supremacy, "to the face, because he was to be blamed." There is nothing now reserved, nothing of a sacred character to which all believers were not admitted; if two of the apostles go down to a Samaritan town to "lay their hands" on persons who at the preaching of Philip had turned to the Lord, the rank and file of the church at Antioch,

"lay their hands," on the heads of Barnabas and Paul.

Whatever our Lord may have intended by His saying to Peter, "Thou art Peter and on this rock will I build My church," it is clear, the Apostles themselves did not in the least understand that St. Peter was thereby, in any sense, placed over them. His own words in this epistle have no breath in them of authority. "The elders therefore among you I exhort, who am also a fellow-elder, and a witness of the sufferings of Christ, who am also a partaker of the glory that shall be revealed: Tend the flocks of God which is among you, exercising the oversight, not of constraint, but willingly, according unto God; nor yet for filthy lucre, but of a ready mind; neither as lording it over the charge allotted to you, but making yourselves ensamples to the flock."

Had St. Peter considered him-

self to have been invested with any authority he must have, in such connection, alluded to it. At the first council called at Jerusalem, St. James, if he did not preside, pronounced the decision.

St. Paul not only recognizes no apostolic authority, but with some impatience, he repels any supposition of the superiority of any of the Apostles. Had St. Peter been by the Lord appointed to any supremacy, no one would have sooner recognized the command than St. Paul, and yet what does he write to the Galatians, concerning the elders at Jerusalem?

"Of these who seem to be somewhat, (whatsoever they were it maketh no matter to me: God accepteth no man's person:) for they who seemed to be somewhat in conference added nothing to me: . . . And when James, Cephas and John, who seemed to be pillars, perceived the grace that was given unto me, they

gave to me and Barnabas the right hands of fellowship."

"The gifts of the Spirit" were not restrained to one class, they were received indiscriminately by men and women alike, "severally as He willed." The seven daughters of Philip preached the Gospel. All the believers at the first were of one mind, they were all baptized and they all commemorated their Lord, in the special way in which He had directed, "breaking bread at home." (R. V.) There is no hint that an apostle, or anybody appointed by the apostles, was required to be present at the breaking of bread; indeed to suggest such, would plainly be out of keeping with the evident polity of the New Testament church.

The only ritual then was, what was essential to order: the necessary regulations of the worship and religious conduct of a multitude.

But before the apostles had

gone to the Master, the old assertion of Self began to be evident, there arose those who would "lord it over God's heritage."

As time went on, and the number of Christians increased, the clergy became a more distinct class; changes occurred in the fashions, but the clergy retained the old dress, they did not change; then the old dress could not be used upon the street, it was kept in the churches and only worn at service. The cassock and the surplice are the outer garments once worn by gentlemen. So with the service itself; time changed customs, modes of expression, kinds of bread, but the clergy as they retained the old dress, also retained the old customs, the old expressions, the old kinds of bread. Thus gradually that which was ecclesiastical became quite different from what was in common vogue. Missionaries took with them to foreign countries what

they had been accustomed to at home, and still further in these countries, did "the things which accompany salvation" become separated from common life.

The old temptation was ever present with the Clerics. They wanted, what all men seek after, power, distinction. To gain it more effectively, they began to draw together the rent vail, and hide again the most sacred part of the sanctuary; taking care to let all men know that they had open access to the Holy of Holies.

They gradually assumed priestly dignity. All they wanted to complete their desire, was a sacrifice. The only possible place where anything approaching a sacrifice was conceivable, was in what they had already managed to have called "The mysteries"; in the elements of the Lord's Supper.

It was many centuries, however, before this desire was fully consummated; it was not until

the Council of Lateran, A. D., 1215, that the doctrine of Transubstantiation was decreed to the world to be an Article of Faith; then was expressed what, for long, the clerics had been approaching, that the bread and wine of the Holy Communion were actually the Victim of the Sacrifice; the Lord's table was an altar; and the minister, was what he had longed to be, a veritable Priest.

It will be said that this is not a true digest of history; that from the earliest times, the Christian Fathers all write of the Sacrifice, and although no such distinctive word as Transubstantiation was ever used, still as it is with the doctrine of the Trinity, the teaching is throughout the Bible, although the word Trinity is never written, so the change of the Bread and Wine into the Body and Blood of the Lord, was always admitted and expressed, although the word Transubstan-

tiation which expresses the actual fact of the change, was never used for eleven centuries after the Institution.

By far the greater part of Christendom are convinced that the Sacrifice of the Mass is Catholic doctrine; that it was always held everywhere, at all times, and by all men.

A careful reading of the Fathers, however, will not support this view.

Bishop Thirwall has always been considered one of the most powerful minds which this generation has seen on the Episcopal bench. It was the general opinion that had he been a lawyer, he would have been the Lord Chancellor. In 1874 he wrote a letter to the London *Times*, in which he referred to a book written by Canon Vogan on "The true doctrine of the Eucharist"; Thirwall said, in his opinion, "the book was unanswerable." Two

copies had been sent to Dr. Pusey who had remained silent, because he had nothing to say.

Dr. Vogan examines the whole catena of the Fathers, with a view to meet Archdeacon Wilberforce's assertion, that "beyond all contradiction no doctrine of the Christian religion is affirmed with more unanimity by all ancient writers, than the truth of the Eucharistic Sacrifice;" and the conclusion he reaches, after copiously quoting what references the Fathers make to the subject is this:—p. 419—"that, indeed, the Holy Eucharist was understood to be a sacrifice by the Ancient Church, is unquestionable; but that the elements of bread and wine were understood to be the sacrifice by the Primitive Church, —by that part of the Ancient Church which existed in the first ages,—is quite another proposition, and has never yet been proved. The distinction must

ever be remembered between the Service or rite of the Eucharist, and the Elements used in it; and the distinction of the senses in which the word sacrifice is employed in either case.

"The service itself is called the Eucharistic Sacrifice, or the Sacrifice; and this most properly because we do offer sacrifice in it; the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, which is the great characteristic of the service; the sacrifice of ourselves, our souls and bodies, and of all that we have, which 'we offer and present unto' the Lord. But when the elements of bread and wine, either by themselves, or in combination with that which they signify, are spoken of as the Eucharistic Sacrifice made by the Priest and the worshippers through him: then a doctrine is enunciated, for proof of which the records of the Primitive Church are searched in vain: and they can only be made to

confirm it by an utter confusion of terms, and by, in reality, taking for granted the question to be proved."

This expression of the mind of the Catholic Church is faithfully represented in our Communion office. Sacrifice is only mentioned three times; "our *sacrifice* of prayer and praise;" "we offer and present unto Thee our souls and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy and living *sacrifice* unto Thee:" and "we beseech Thee to accept this (*sacrifice* of) our bounden duty and service."

As there is nothing approaching a material sacrifice, so there is no "altar," in the Prayer Book. The Lord's table intimates exactly what the Holy Communion in its essence is, a meal with God. It was foreshadowed in the fact that of all the sacrifices but one —the whole Burnt-offering—the worshippers partook; the rest of the Sacrifice being consumed by

God, as it were, by fire. Its astonishing counterpart is recorded in Exodus xxiv. The blood of the Burnt-offerings and of the Peace-offerings Moses took and sprinkled on the altar and on the book of the Covenant, and on the people, when they had voluntarily entered into Covenant. "Then went up Moses and Aaron, Nadab and Abihu, and seventy of the elders of Israel: and they saw the God of Israel; and there was under his feet as it were a paved work of a sapphire stone, as it were the body of heaven in his clearness. And upon the nobles of the children of Israel He laid not his hand; also they saw God, and did eat and drink"—and it must have been this remarkable incident, that our Lord had in his mind, on the occasion when the Elders of the Christian Church were eating with Him. Moses had said on that occasion, "Behold the blood of the Covenant which the Lord

hath made with you;" and now the Lord Jesus says, "This is my blood of the new Covenant which is shed for many"—and He held in his hand "the Cup of Blessing," of that wine "which maketh glad the heart of man."

If the Sacerdotalists were right in their assertion, that the Sacrifice of the Mass is the true Catholic doctrine, how comes it to pass that in the Acts of the Apostles and the Epistles, there are only two mentions of the Eucharist? It is of no avail to say that the value of the Institution was not at first recognized, and it gradually took the preëminent position which the Lord had from the first intended for it.

Because every sacrificing priest traces his power to the words of the Institution and his orders in an Apostolic descent of ministry.

He believes that he, by virtue of his Episcopal ordination, pos-

sesses the same power and effects the same change in the Bread and Wine as he believes the Lord Himself wrought when He said the words of consecration.

No pretense has ever been made that any additional power has, since the night of the Institution, been bestowed on the lawful ministers of the Church; all that they have now they derive from that which the Lord bestowed when He said, "Do this in remembrance of Me." A library has been written to show that the mine of Sacerdotal wealth lies in the little word "do"; that its meaning really is, "sacrifice," or "do this sacrifice in remembrance of Me;" or to render the latter words in keeping with the sacrificing idea, "offer this sacrifice as my Memorial."

If this were the true intention of the narrative, then the apostles must have been aware of it. They surely were under the guidance of

that Spirit whose purpose it was to lead them into all truth.

The Holy Eucharist would have at once taken the position in the Church's worship to which the Catholics have succeeded in elevating it. The Mass is with them well-nigh the only service. If this were the mind of the primitive church, how comes it to pass that, a generation after the Institution, writing all kinds of epistles, not one of the apostles so much as mentions this one and central service, except St. Paul, and he to correct the abuses of the Agape! Imagine a High Church Bishop writing a letter to a young priest he had set over a distant congregation; he alludes to every element in the Christian character; he leaves no part of his ministry untouched, he even prescribes for his weak digestion; but he never mentions or in any way alludes to the one great function from which he draws all his priestly

prestige, and by which alone his flock is to be fed with the heavenly food!

The supposition is impossible!

Perhaps it is, that the Holy Ghost, as was evidently his merciful intention concerning the Blessed Virgin, foreseeing how in idolatrous worship her name would be desecrated, caused the Holy men who wrote the Scriptures to scarcely mention her; so with regard to the Lord's Supper. If, as is most probable, the Lord intended every meal to be a sacrament, and the breaking of the daily bread to be a constant remembrance of his death and passion, the Holy Ghost, foreseeing the wrong teaching the pride of the human heart would weave about "the breaking of bread," caused the apostles to refrain from any mention of the common practice, lest any sanction should be given to that which is far from "the mind of Christ."

If the theory of Transubstantiation were true; if at the pronouncing of the Words of the Institution the power of the priest performed so vast a miracle, then the Words of the Institution would have most carefully been recorded; whereas the four accounts of this most solemn act are singularly diverse.

St. Paul received his account by Revelation, his, therefore, must be the most correct. St. Luke, whose Gospel had for its foundation what St. Paul preached, tells us he took pains to substantiate what he wrote from those who, "from the beginning, were eye-witnesses and ministers of the Word." Neither St. Paul nor St. Luke record any words of consecration directly spoken of the Blood; but each of them has the same expression, "This cup is the new covenant in my Blood, poured out for you;" and in the Greek, "poured out" agrees

The Words of the Institution.

St. Matt.	St. Mark	St. Luke	St. Paul
Take eat: this is my body.	Take eat: this is my body.	This is my body which is given for you, do this in remembrance of Me.	Take eat: this is my body which is broken for you; this do in remembrance of Me.
Drink ye all of it; for this is my blood of the new covenant; which is shed for many for the remission of sins.	This is my blood of the new covenant which is shed for many.	This cup is the new covenant in my blood; which is shed for you.	This cup is the new covenant in my blood; this do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of Me.

with "cup" and not with "Blood"!

Another very significant fact, which altogether opposes the notion of Transubstantiation, is found in the wording of St. Luke's account in the Vulgate. The Vulgate is the only authorized Roman Catholic bible.

Pope Sixtus V. pronounced the greater anathema upon any one who declined to accept its readings; it is therefore binding on all Roman Catholics. Now, when the priest pronounces the supposed words of consecration, and the Wafer becomes the Host, "body, blood, bones, and nerves of Jesus Christ," the glorified body of the Lord can only be meant.

But the Vulgate says, when the Lord Himself spake the words, He referred to the body which was then present before his disciples. "This is my body which shall be given (tradetur) for you." "This cup is the new covenant in my

blood which shall be shed (effundetur) for you."

Whatever the Lord meant, by this reading He undoubtedly refers to his body before his crucifixion, the body of his humiliation. The only authorized Roman Catholic Bible is itself condemnatory of the doctrine of Transubstantiation.

So likewise is any Bible; for the universal record tells how that Christ shed all his blood at Calvary. When He appeared after his resurrection his risen body had no blood. The wounds were so wide gaping that Thomas, thirteen days after the Crucifixion, could have put his fingers into the print of the nails, and he could have thrust his hand into the awful wound in his side; evidently the open sores were not bleeding. The Lord, in quieting the natural fright of the company, carefully avoided using the ordinary phrase and said, "a spirit hath not flesh

and bones as ye see Me have;" He did not say "Flesh and blood," for He had parted with the vitiated blood of Adam at the cross. If then the Lord's glorified body contains no blood, how can the doctrine of Transubstantiation be true, which asserts that every time the priest consecrates the wine, it becomes, under the species of wine, the veritable blood of the Lord Jesus Christ; not the blood which coursed in his veins before his Crucifixion, but that which is now His, the blood of His glorified body?

The pretensions of sacerdotalism are wholly based upon the assumed power and prerogative of the sacrificing priest.

It is immensely flattering to the pride of men, who have little or no capability of leadership; who, weighed in their college examinations, were found "lighter than vanity itself"; who started out in life with ambitions they were hope-

lessly inadequate to attain; it is immensely flattering to such men to find a ready mode of attaining their heart's desire, at no cost whatever; only a brave assumption, and the existence of a number of people to accept it.

And with men of weightier build let the scalpel of the moral anatomist dissect their motives and at the very heart of their energy will be discovered the love of Self-importance.

This was the impetus of Manning's career as Mr. Purcell laid open with such unsparing candor, that Cardinal Vaughan stigmatized his too faithful portraiture of Manning "a crime"; and the Roman Catholics have issued an expurgated edition, if possible to rehabilitate the soiled cardinal.

How enormous is the temptation for any man to cultivate sacerdotalism let the following description of the power of the Priest explain.

This astounding assertion is the logical conclusion which the belief and practice of every sacerdotalist must reach. If any one, in any sense, "adores" the elements, they can only do so, under the belief that the Lord in Real Presence is in them. The explanation may be veiled by the use of various terms, but the act of adoration; the excessive care connected with the Sacred Vessels; the celebrant alone handling them; bringing them to the altar, and taking them away, covered with vestments of their own; the long continued cleansing of fingers, paten, chalice; the corporal acts before and after consecration; have one and only one explanatory reason for their doing, and that reason lies in the belief, that after consecration the elements are not what they were before, and if any change has taken place, it can only be one, *the one* which makes the celebrant a ver-

itable priest and which indicates that he possesses the power which Abbé Gaume boldly puts into language.

Similar language may be heard from any Roman Catholic pulpit; and the more unintelligent and superstitious the congregation the more outspoken is the awful assumption of the priest; and every clergyman who is, in any sense, a sacerdotalist if he had capability or honesty would express his belief in the language of the abbé. —Abbé Gaume is a French ecclesiastic whose books have found favor with the sacerdotalists, because they express "the thoughts and intents of their hearts." It was the abbé's "*Manuel de Confesseurs*" that Dr. Pusey adapted for English priests who practised confession. A fuller adaptation forms the celebrated book "*The Priest in absolution.*"

In his *Catechisme de perseverance* Vol. IV., p. 288, the belief of

the sacerdotalists is thus nakedly stated:

"What language of man can tell the dignity of the priesthood and the greatness of the Priest?

The first man was great, who, established as King of the universe, commanded all the inhabitants of his vast domain, and was obeyed with docility.

Moses was great, who by a word divided the waters of the sea, and made an entire nation to pass between their suspended masses.

Joshua was great, who spake to the sun, "Sun, stand thou still," and the sun stayed, obeying the voice of a mortal.

Kings of the earth are great, who command vast armies and make the world tremble at the sound of their name.

Eh bieu! There is *one* man greater still.

He is a man who every day when he pleases opens the gates of Heaven, and addressing himself

to the Son of the Eternal, to the Monarch of the worlds, says to Him,—

'Descend from your throne. Come!' Docile at the voice of this man, the Word of God, He by whom all things were made, instantly descends from the seat of his glory and incarnates Himself in the hands of this man (s'incarne entre les mains) more powerful than Kings, than the august Mary. And this man says to Him,—

'Thou art my son, this day have I begotten Thee. Thou art my victim'—and He lets Himself be immolated by this man, placed where he wills, given to whom he chooses; this man is the PRIEST!

The Priest is not only all powerful in heaven and over the natural body of the Man-God, he is all powerful on earth over the mystical body of Jesus Christ.

Voilà! a man has fallen into

the toils of the devil, what power can deliver him? Call to the help of this wretch the angels and archangels, St. Michael himself, chief of the heavenly militia, conqueror of Satan and his rebellious legions. The holy archangel can well drive away the fiends who are laying siege to the unfortunate, but not the one within his heart. He will never be able to break the chains of the sinner who had put his trust in him.

Whom then will you ask to deliver him? Call upon Mary, the Mother of God, the Queen of angels and of men, the terror of hell. She can well pray for his soul, but she would not know how to absolve him from any fault however small; the Priest *can!*

Nay, more,—let us suppose that the Redeemer is descending in person visibly in a church and establishing Himself within a

confessional to administer the Sacrament of Penance, at the same moment that the Priest is seating himself in another.

The Son of God says, 'I absolve thee,' and the Priest on his part says, 'I absolve thee,' and the penitent finds himself EQUALLY absolved by the One as by the Other.

Thus the priest, powerful as God, can in an instant snatch the sinner from hell, render him fit for Paradise, and make of a slave of the devil, a Son of Abraham. . . .

God Himself is obliged to adhere to the judgment of the Priest, to refuse or to accord his pardon as the Priest refuses or accords the absolution, if the penitent be worthy of it. The sentence of the Priest goes before. God does nothing but subscribe to it. Can a greater power, a higher dignity be imagined?"

Awful, stupendous blasphemy!

It is difficult to believe that clergymen of that branch of the Catholic Church which reformed itself of these astounding pretensions of sacerdotalism, who, at their ordination, professed their adherence to the assertions of the xxxix. Articles, could be found holding and, "in an underhand way," (Hurrell Froude) teaching the very doctrines the Articles were framed to deny.

Let these extracts, from various books published in the interests of the Catholic movement, by English clergymen, speak for themselves.

"Now there are, of course, many Catholic practices that necessarily result from a belief in the Real Presence of our dear Lord upon the altar. Among minor ones are bowing and genuflecting. Bowing to the altar at all times; not because it is so much wood or stone put together in a certain shape, covered with

handsome cloths, decked with flowers and lights; not for this, were it all ten times as gorgeous. Not for this, but because the Altar is the Throne of God Incarnate, where *daily* now, thank God, in many a church in the land He deigns to rest. . . . And genuflecting, not to the altar, but to the '*Gift that is upon it;*' to the God-Man, Christ Jesus, when He is there."

Six plain sermons, by Richard Wilkins, Priest, p. 57, London: E. Longhurst.

"Let every one who hears you speak, or sees you worship, feel quite sure that the object of your devotion is not an idea, or a sentiment, or a theory, or a make-believe, but a real personal King and Master and Lord: present at all times everywhere in the omnipresence of his *Divine* nature, present by his own promise, and his own supernatural power in his *Human* nature too upon his

Altar-Throne, there to be worshipped in the Blessed Sacrament as really, and literally, and actually, as you will necessarily worship Him when you see Him in his beauty in Heaven."

Sermon by the Rev. H. D. Nihill, Vicar of St. Michael's, Shoreditch.

"Think of Jesus on the Cross dying for you. Think of his coming down upon our altars under the forms of Bread and Wine!

"Every crumb on the paten, every drop in the chalice has now become the whole Body, Blood, Soul, Spirit and Divinity of Jesus!

"Now is the time for you to worship Him!"

The Server's Mass Book; by the Rev. G. P. Grantham, London: Masters.

"Other Sacraments contain the Grace of God, but the Holy Eucharist is God Himself."

Practical thoughts for Sisters of Charity. London: Hodges.

"Kenneth understood now, and he would understand more some day, how that Jesus comes at the bidding of his Priest upon the altar, and passes Himself into the little pieces of Bread and into the Wine in the chalice, and so is 'verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper.'"

". . . And then to think that Jesus comes His own very Self to offer Himself in sacrifice to God, and to listen to all our prayers. That's the sign He's come, when the big bell tolls three, just as the Priest says the words of consecration, 'This is my Body'—'This is my Blood.'"

Stories told to the Choir. Oxford: Mowbray.

"The Sacrifice of the Altar is one and the same Sacrifice with

that offered on Calvary. It is not a different Sacrifice, nor a repetition: it is the same."

Golden Gate, by the Rev. S. Baring-Gould.

In 1862 a society for the purpose of disseminating the teaching of the Real Presence in the Eucharist was formed; it was styled The Confraternity of the Blessed Sacrament, the C. B. S.

Canon Carter of Clewer was its first Superior General. It is conducted with no little secrecy and although 15,000 "*Intercession papers*" are printed monthly it is seldom any are seen except by the initiated.

This society holds its anniversary on Corpus Christi day, a popish festival, at which the sermon is preached by some prominent clergyman.

The three following extracts from three of such sermons may well be taken as conclusive evi-

dence that to use the words of the Superior General, "No such difference, as is commonly supposed, exists between us (the Church of England) and the Church of Rome on this great doctrine of Eucharistic adoration:

"That the Holy Eucharist is the Body and Blood of Christ under the forms of Bread and Wine, that therein is Christ Himself, his Body, Soul and Divinity, as truly as at Bethlehem, or Nazareth or Calvary or at the right hand of God, we take as certain." The Rev. A. H. Ward.

"The Eucharistic sacrifice is a necessary consequence of the Real Presence. If the Bread and Wine become, by the action of the Holy Ghost in consecration, the Body and Blood of Christ, it follows that when we offer the sacrament we offer the Body and Blood of Christ, *i. e.*, Christ Himself under the forms of Bread and Wine." Canon Body.

"Christ is present in the Eucharist indeed externally to us, objectively and really; He is present as the Bread of life, the Sacrifice for sins, the Object of Worship. He is present wherever the consecrated elements are." Canon Gore.

II.

THIS DOCTRINE OF TRANSUBSTANTIATION TESTED BY A PRACTICAL RESULT.

"By their fruits ye shall know them."
Matt. vii. 20.

If it were true, that upon consecration the Bread and Wine become the actual Body and Blood of the Lord Christ, then it would reasonably follow that those who most frequently communicated would become most Christlike; that they would be distinguished by superior holiness; by transparent truthfulness; and by that wisdom, which "Jesus Christ is made unto us."

Let us ask if this be the case? Are Roman Catholics the most pious people in the community? Are the priests the most Christ-

like men we know? Is the morality of the Roman Church conspicuous for its transparent truthfulness? Have the destinies of peoples directed by Roman Catholics been illustrations of wise and great government?

In the apex of a system we ought to find the culmination of its principles; in the Pope, the Holy Father, we have a right to look for every virtue and every wisdom which can be claimed by the theory of the Church. In accordance with that theory he rightly styles himself, "The Vicar of Christ on earth;" nay, the sentence "Our Lord God the Pope" occurs in Catholic writings.

But without bringing his life to the standard of the very righteousness of God Himself, let us be content with the style universally accorded to the Pope, the Holy Father. Does the system produce in its head that Holiness

"without which no man shall see the Lord"?

One of the most blushing pages of history is that of the lives of the Popes of the years immediately preceding the Reformation. John XII. literally turned the Lateran palace into a house of ill-fame.

Sixtus IV., Savonarola's Pope, was so bad a man that Europe sighed with relief when he was called to his long account. Innocent VIII. was the very antithesis of his name: while it is said that his successor, Alexander VI., combined in his person every vice of which human nature is capable. The dismal list could be almost indefinitely lengthened.

This is not a matter of any controversy, but every one knows that the vile lives of these Popes are matters of fact. "A good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit"; if the fruit be evil then unquestionably the tree is corrupt.

Roman Catholics parry this fatal blow to their system, by referring to Judas. But the cases are by no means similar. Before Judas fell, the Holy Ghost had not descended; he was chosen by our Lord and was not the outcome of any system; our Lord foreknew his betrayer.

The theory of the Roman Church is, that the Church is an organism vitalized by the Holy Ghost; that the head of this Body is the Pope; that when he speaks *ex Cathedrâ*, he must speak truth, and is therefore infallible. The fact that there have been many Popes, who did not speak truth and whose lives were not Holy, disproves the theory. All that the history of Judas can be made to teach is, that Bunyan was not dreaming when he said that "there was a way to Hell hard by the gate of Heaven."

If this were a scientific matter and the question of a widely ac-

cepted theory were under discussion, such a theory for example, as the corpuscular theory of light, conceived and so ably supported by Sir Isaac Newton, when an *experimentum crucis* was discovered which put the truth of the theory to the test, and the behavior of a ray of light in practice was contrary to that, which according to Newton's theory it ought to have been, the scientific world instantly abandoned the theory, hitherto universally held, and adopted the Wave theory. It did this not only without regret, but it rejoiced to abandon the old supposition, as soon as ever it was satisfied that it was contradicted by facts. Then why should not the Religious World, seeing the Sacerdotal System has been weighed in the balances of experience and found wanting, why should it not abandon a discredited theory?

If the stupendous power, which

the theory of Transubstantiation presupposes, actually existed, how comes it to pass that wherever the priests have been dominant, disaster and decay have supervened?

The history of mankind has substantiated the wise man's assertion, that "Righteousness exalteth a nation." The fall of nations has been invariably due to that licentiousness which always accompanies unregulated prosperity. If now the God of righteousness had really committed to men such power, as the sacerdotalists would have us believe, He could only have done so, upon the condition of their keeping of his commandments. It is impossible to suppose that He would continue such grace to men unless they pleased Him; it has always been true, that, "to obey is better than sacrifice," and unless his ministers work righteousness, He casts them out of

his Presence; "Every branch in Me that beareth not fruit He taketh away." If then the power of the priesthood has been real, they must have been righteous; and wherever their influence was felt in government, that nation must have thriven, because there is no surer path to prosperity than a righteous government.

What answer does history give to this experimentum crucis?

The reply is not unhesitating. Wherever the Roman Catholic faith has been accepted by a nation, that nation has degenerated; and wherever the dominance of the Pope and his priests has been thrown off, from that moment the liberated nation began to thrive, and to-day the powers of the world are the Protestant nations, while the Catholic countries are falling into decrepitude.

Previous to 1870 the greater part of Italy was under the direct

temporal government of the Pope. The government became so iniquitous and corrupt, that the people rose under the lead of Garibaldi and wrenched the reins out of the hands of God's priests. Gavazzi went throughout Europe exposing their shameful prostitution of temporal power.

Whatever prosperity Italy has since achieved as a kingdom, has been not because of, but in spite of, the priests who have followed the röle of the Pope and sulked.

Strangely suggestive is the fact that the blessing of the Vicar of Christ has usually proved a very curse. This of itself, should make men hesitate to believe that the Pope was indeed "God's vice-gerent on earth," for "the blessing of the Lord it maketh rich, and He addeth no sorrow with it."

Pope Pius V. gave his Pontifical blessing to the Duke of Alva when that gentle Christian undertook to stamp out Protestantism in the

Netherlands; the result was that Protestant Holland became immediately one of the leading Powers of Europe.

In 1701 Pope Clement XI. anathematized the new king of Prussia; he sent to all the courts of Europe his malediction of the new monarch, because, quoting the prophecy of Hosea, "They have set up kings, but not by me; they have made princes, and I knew it not." The result has been that the King of Prussia, is the Emperor of Germany.

Pope Sixtus V., blessed with every imaginable glory of circumstance, the Spanish Armada, which was to restore England to the Catholic fold; it was from that year of grace 1588, that the astounding rise of England's greatness is dated. Queen Elizabeth was then ruling 6,000,000, only 1,000,000 of whom could read and write, and now the Anglo-Saxons number 100,000,000!

If in any department of life, the influence of Godliness ought to be felt it is in family life. The Confessional is the great power of the Roman hierarchy, the priest, as we have seen Abbé Gaume puts it, can forgive sins on an equality with God Himself, and the prerequisite of Absolution is Confession. By this assumption the Priest reaches the sacrum sanctorum of family life. If he were a very servant of God, speaking in the secret places, with the pureness and wisdom of one inspired by the Holy Ghost, what a blessed spiritual director would he be, and how beneficent would be the results of his guidance! But what is actually the case?

In France, the greatest of Catholic countries, the deaths now exceed the births; it is only a matter of time when the French nation will become extinct. Statisticians tell us that it would take Catholic countries one hundred and thirty-

eight years to double their populations, whereas Protestant countries, where the families are undirected by spiritual fathers, will double their numbers in sixty years. This fact speaks volumes.

Four centuries ago—when all the world was Catholic—Spain was the leading power. What is she to-day? a collapsed bladder pricked by the Protestant sword of America! a denouement, in spite of the Pope's blessing, and the saying of millions of masses, which people who knew anything of the internal condition of Spain fully expected. From a government report published in 1896, it appears that Spain has a population of 19,000,000, no fewer than 8,727,519 persons profess no occupation. There are 91,227 professional beggars; 43,328 members of the priestly caste; 28,519 nuns; there are 6,104,470 absolutely unlettered persons.

For this complete rottenness

Spain has to thank the godlike assumptions of the priests; living themselves a lie, they have breathed dishonesty and incapacity into the very vitals of the country.

Look at "poor Ireland." The north of that disturbed island is Protestant; it is thriving and loyal. The middle and south is exactly the reverse. An article by an English Roman Catholic, Mr. Richard Bagot, was written for the chief ecclesiastical journal in Rome, the *Nuova Autologia*, to give the Italians a true idea of the present Ecclesiastical disturbance in England. Mr. Bagot warned his readers to disabuse themselves of the notion that England would ever become Roman Catholic, or indeed that Roman Catholicism was at all gaining ground. For this opinion he gave many proofs, amongst which was the conclusive fact, that Roman Catholic marriages were

in 1894 only 4.2 per cent. of the whole.

Amongst the reasons for the rooted antipathy of the English to the sacerdotal system of Rome, he cites, the object lesson the English have, from the present condition of Catholic countries; France is "an astonishment and a hissing." And the sight presented by the two sections of Ireland is convincing. I cite Mr. Bagot as a witness to the fact that the results of priest-rule have always been to deteriorate and ruin the population where it had gained supremacy.

If the theory of Transubstantiation be true, then it must follow, that they who most participate of the Host, do incorporate with themselves most of Him, who declared He was the Truth; and that "to bear witness to the Truth," was the one purport He had in coming into the world.

They, more than other men, will be able to perceive Truth and will have more "truth in their inward parts."

There is nothing more remarkable in history than the extraordinary deception which has been practiced upon the Catholic church, and the insusceptibility to Truth which is cultivated by imbibing the tenets of the Roman Catholic faith.

The whole structure of their organization has been reared on three falsehoods. The Clementine Homilies; the Donative of Constantine; and the Isidorian Decretals.

The Clementine Homilies and Recognitions were patent forgeries, produced by the Ebionites, a Jewish-Christian heretical sect, to support their own case, by citing supposed speeches of St. Peter which they invented for the purpose.

"It is doubtful," says Dr. Sal-

mon, "whether Clement was introduced into the earliest form of it; but he was, at a comparatively early date, (the beginning of the third century) made the narrator of the story."

It is in this work that Clement says Peter was the first Bishop of Rome, and that he consecrated him as his successor, although the chief apostle had gone to his Master twenty-seven years previously. It is upon this assertion, in a document now admitted by the literary world to be a forgery, that the whole stupendous system of the Popedom, founded on St. Peter being Bishop of Rome, is built up.

The Donation of Constantine, was likewise a forgery; purporting to be a grant of temporal power to the Pope of Rome by Constantine the first Christian Emperor.

But the palm of forgery must be yielded to Isidore of Seville, who in the ninth century, pro-

duced more than 100 epistles, which were forged decretals of thirty successive Popes in the first three centuries. "Upon these spurious decretals," *The Isidorian decretals*, says the historian Hallam, "was built the great fabric of the Papal Supremacy."

What astonishes us is, how generations of men, many of whom must have been genuinely honest, could receive as trustworthy, and base upon them, a stupendous religious system to which they committed their eternal salvation, three authorities which are so palpably frauds. Lightfoot accounts for the wonder by the ignorance then prevalent. But our present purpose is to use the non-detection of these forgeries, as proof, that the church which accepted them as genuine, could not have been under the direct guidance of the Holy Spirit whose prerogative it is to lead men into all Truth.

And that now, when the clear light of these later centuries has exposed the worthlessness of these documents that they still retain their positions as the very foundation stones of the Papal edifice, is a further proof of the fact that the organism cannot be vitalized by the Spirit of Truth.

If these tests of the theory of Sacerdotalism be not sufficient to declare it to be untrue, a decisive coup is offered by the doctrine of the Infallibility of the Pope, when speaking ex cathedrâ on faith and morals. This assumption is the proper and logical outcome of the theory.

If Sacerdotalism possesses the powers it claims, then the system speaking through its mouthpiece the Pope, must utter absolute truth.

It was a brave defiance to the rest of Christendom when the Roman church in 1870 adopted the

doctrine of Infallibility as a tenet of the Church's teaching; it was a rash submittal of the theory to ready test.

We need only apply two tests to show its untenableness.

I have open before me a black-letter Breviary, printed in 1563.

The 28th of June is the day of "St. Leo, Pope and martyr"; the Lection, which is read at Matins, is a short digest of his life and doings. He is chiefly remembered as the convener of the sixth ecumenical council, that of Constantinople, A. D., 680. Lection III. reads, "In qua synodo condemnati sunt Cyrus; Sergius; Honorius; Pyrrhus; Paulus et Petrus . . . qua unam voluntatem et operationem in Domino Jesu Christo dixerunt."

This council, the last "general" council, was called to deal with the Monothelite Heresy, which imputed one will to our Lord

Jesus Christ. In the acts of the council it is stated:

"Together with the dogmatic letters of Sergius (the patriarch of Constantinople) we have examined that of Honorius and have found them altogether alien from the Apostolic teaching, the definitions of Councils and the doctrine of all approved Fathers and that contrariwise they follow the false teachings of the heretics.

"We altogether reject and abhor them as soul-destroying.

"We have moreover expelled from God's Holy Catholic church and anathematized Honorius, who was Pope of old Rome, because in his letters to Sergius he has followed the same doctrine and confirmed his impious dogmas. . . .

"These writings we have caused to be burned for their complete annihilation. . . .

"*Anathema to the heretic Sergius. Anathema to the heretic Honorius.*"

Here then is a veritable *experimentum crucis* of this theory which, logically developed, leads to the Infallibility of the Pope. A general council anathematizes a Pope. This historical fact, which redounds to the glory of another Pope who was canonized chiefly for his faithful defence of orthodoxy, was read from the altars of the Church on St. Leo's day, June 28th, down to the middle of the sixteenth century. So that the Church, for some 1,000 years, continuously proclaimed its approval of the deed of the last Ecumenical Council. What stronger expression is possible of the mind of the Church? and yet this mind condemns a Pope.

Either the Church was wrong in its opinion, or the Pope Honorius was right in his belief of what the Church stigmatized as a "soul-destroying" doctrine; in either case the theory that God the Holy Ghost found utterance

by the one and by the other cannot be true.

The damning fact of the condemnation of Pope Honorius to the establishing of the tenet of the Infallibility of the Pope, was so evident, that his name was dropped from the Breviary after the council of Trent, (a Roman Catholic writer says "for the sake of brevity") about the middle of the sixteenth century. The paragraph reads in a Breviary dated A. D., 1597.

"In eo consilio Cyrus, Sergius et Pyrrhus condemnati sunt, unam tantummodo voluntatem et operationem in Christo predicantes."

The second test is even more conclusive. The authorized version of the Bible of the Roman Church is the Vulgate. This Latin edition was the work of Pope Sixtus V. "He had felt," he says, "from his first accession to the

Papal throne great grief, or even indignation, that the Tridentine decree (as to the publishing of an authoritative text of the Scriptures) was still unsatisfied." The Pope appointed a Board to prepare the work; he himself examined the sheets with the utmost care, and corrected the errors with his own hand.

Sixtus had no doubts of the theory of sacerdotal power; he says, "By the fulness of apostolic power we decree and declare that this edition . . . approved by the authority delivered to us by the Lord, is to be received and held as true, lawful, authentic and unquestioned in all public and private discussion, reading, preaching and explanation."

And he appended the greater excommunication against any one who should demur to his *ipse dixit*.

Now here is an opportunity of testing the worth of the assumed

power of the Holy Ghost operating through the Pope.

If that power really existed, that is, if the theory of the Catholic Church be true, then the work of SIXTUS would be as correct as if it were verbally inspired by the Divine mind; but what is the fact? There are at least 2,000 gross mistakes in the New Testament alone. SIXTUS died in the same year as his edition was published.

The authorities found themselves in a very serious dilemma; the Church had an Authorised Version of the Bible full of mistakes, irrevocably thrust upon it, and manacled to it forever by the plenary authority of the infallible Pope. To admit this, would be to cut off the branch they were sitting on, and allow the fallibility of the mouthpiece of the Church.

So flagrant, however, were some of the errors and readings that some advised, that at all costs,

Sixtus' edition should be prohibited; but the celebrated casuist Bellarmine proposed a middle course, worthy of his Jesuitical mind, that the errors "should be corrected with all possible speed, and the Bible reprinted under the name of Sixtus, with a prefatory note to the effect that some errors had crept into the former edition *by the carelessness of the printers!*"

Although Bellarmine's advice was followed the Vulgate is still full of errors, some of which have given authority to erroneous teaching. The doctrine of penance, so conducive of a mechanical way of salvation, is founded on the mistranslation of the Greek for "Repentance."

The cry of the Baptist *Μετανοεῖτε*, "*change your minds*," is rendered in the Vulgate, Pœnitentiam agite, "*do penance*," a mistranslation which gives a wholly different conception.

The errors in the Vulgate are determined and unimpeachable witnesses against the sacerdotal assumption.

There still remains for consideration a forcible disproof of this mechanical theory of salvation in the effect its adoption has of debasing the sense of Truth in the individual. If the theory were true, then the more the actual body of the Lord Jesus were incorporated with the body of the recipient, the more Christlike must he, of necessity, become; and this divine nature would be most surely shown in truthfulness of disposition for "no lie is of the truth."

It is impossible for the mind always to be carrying an opinion, which it will never surrender at any cost, but which is constantly being seriously attacked, without acquiring a habit of apology; of supple escape from conviction; of

hedging and finally of lying; or else the mind relapses into disuse, and in that region of mental activity becomes atrophied; it accepts statements without question or investigation and becomes in that department mechanical and unintelligent.

The doctrine of the Gospel is, that by reason of the Incarnation of the Son of God, a new vitality was produced, which is in truth, the Divine nature so modified as to be capable of transacting its impulses through a body of this flesh. That this new nature must become possessed by any man who seeks salvation. When it is received the man is said to be "born again" and to have become a "new creature"; he has "put off the old man with his doings," and having "put on the new man," he "walks in newness of life," having now "nothing to do with sin," he "lives unto Holiness." On the foundations of this

new birth, the New Testament bases the duty of truth-speaking. It is as impossible for a child of God to deliberately tell a lie, and remain unrepentant, as it would be for a thistle to bear figs. The Divine nature cannot lie; and "He that is born of God sinneth not," he cannot lie.

But the casuistry of the Roman Church has been compelled, because of its adherence to an impossible theory, to tamper with truth. It has supplied the language with a new word—*Jesuitical*—which means a use of falsehood to gain an end which seems justifiable.

The doctrines of Reservation and Probabilism advocated and defended by every Roman Casuist, are tersely stated by a pervert to Rome, William George Ward, one of the leaders of the Tractarian Movement, "Make yourself clear that you are justified in deception, and then lie like a trooper."

It is inconclusive to cite any of the great Roman authorities such as Bellarmine or Liguori, because people say, "They lived in surroundings which made it possible, if not permissible, to advocate such tampering with truth; since then the world has moved, and no Roman Catholic teacher would now advance such opinions."

Let us hear, therefore, two living Roman Catholic writers,—

Pruner, who is a recent German authority on Morals, says,

"It is not a lie to tell a falsehood if any one asks about anything about which he is not allowed to ask, for instance if a husband asks his wife whether she has committed adultery."

Father Rickaby, an English Jesuit, writing on the same subject, justifies, "Broad mental reservation for the preservation of some secret which one has a duty to others, or grave reason of one's

own, to keep. In this case you do not speak against your mind (he having just defined a lie to be speaking against your mind) because your mind inserts 'secrets apart' and therefore it is no lie. 'Secrets apart' is the handwriting upon the wall."

I do not allude to this morality for any other reason than to illustrate the mental condition which is induced by constantly dealing with subjects which cannot be made to agree with either reason or experience, and yet which are pertinaciously adhered to.

Men are never known until we have of them a faithful Biography, or until they are placed under the stress of some strong temptation, until they are "tried as by fire." These two conditions have of late occurred to the leaders of English sacerdotalism.

The English nature is matter-of-

fact; and has always been impatient of falsehood. A man in England may be guilty of almost any sin, and retain his social standing, but cheating and lying will inevitably ostracize him. Hence to find Englishmen practicing deceit, and clergymen at that, indicates that they must have been subject to a subtil and powerful force of aberration which has drawn their moral sight asquint.

This obverse attraction is the constant presence of a false idea, and the perpetual endeavor to make it fit into a scheme of religious practice to which it is alien, and the force which induces them to lend themselves to this dubious course, is the love of self-importance. The rebuke of Moses to the priestly pretenders of his day, is still true of the same sort of wilful aspirants. "Ye take too much upon you, ye sons of Levi."

What was well known to the

men in the inner circle, has lately been made painfully public, by the publishing of "The secret history of the Oxford Movement." *The Church Times* and other organs of the sacerdotal party, have heaped vituperation upon its author, but have not contravened his facts and quotations. Reading carefully the lives of Pusey, Newman, Manning, Ward, Faber, Mozley and Oakeley, the great figures of the time, it becomes only too evident how they allowed their consciences to call wrong, right. The whole plan upon which they ordered their ways in dealing with University authorities, bishops and the English public, "Protestant to the backbone," was by a duplex use of language. These men had great minds and were, especially Newman, masters of language, with a fatal dexterity they could juggle with words so as completely to deceive the onlookers.

This lying, they persuaded themselves was not sinning; the opinion they had come to hold was exactly expressed by Newman, in his Apologia, p. 348: "There is some kind or other of verbal misleading which is not sin."

Occasionally one of them "could stand it no longer," and went over to Rome, where he could preach and practice unreservedly what he could only do stealthily and deceitfully when in professed communion with the Anglican Church.

The Rev. William Maskell, Vicar of St. Mary's, in disclosing the reasons for his secession to Rome, well puts the moral condition of the bulk of the sacerdotal party, as he knew it; he writes, "It, (the general plan of their belief and conduct) does seem to be daily, more and more opposed to that single-mindedness of purpose, that simplicity and truthfulness and openness of speech and

action which the Gospel of our Blessed Lord requires."

This is precisely the position needed for a crucial test. If it were true that these men were receiving daily, what they believed they were, the very Body of the Glorified Redeemer, and were in actual fact "eating the Flesh of the Son of Man and drinking his Blood," then they, more than any other body of clergymen in the Church of England, must have been "of the truth," for these men it would have been impossible to have prevaricated, much less, under any circumstances, to have plainly lied; and inasmuch as they, their own selves being the witnesses, did deal deceitfully and in their lives and conversations were "daily more and more opposed to that single-mindedness of purpose, that simplicity and truthfulness and openness of speech and action, which the Gospel of our Blessed Lord requires,"

they offer indubitable proof that their sacerdotal theory is false, and that their doctrine of transubstantiation will not bear the test of the practical application of "pureness of living."

The other opportunity of discovering what is in man, is by observing his behavior in the trying fires of temptation. Just now, the sacerdotal party in England has been caught in the net spread for them by the astute archbishop. His Grace, all his life, had heard them declaim against being ruled in their spiritual behavior, by the laws made for that regulation by secular courts.

They wanted a spiritual head to tell them how to walk. He therefore associated with himself the northern archbishop, so as to spread the net over the whole Island; and their Graces sat to hear and decide two questions;

were incense and lights carried in procession, proper and lawful accompaniments of services directed by the Book of Common Prayer, and allowed by the law of the Anglican Church?

Now everybody in England agrees that Archbishop Temple is a man of great mental calibre; that his temperament is pre-eminently statesmanlike; and that the Rugby boy estimated him rightly—as boys are apt to do their masters, when he wrote of him to his father,—"Temple's a beast; but he's a just beast." When the archbishops therefore gave their verdict, that processional lights and incense were unlawful and must be discontinued, every Englishmen felt that the opinion was weighty; it was not drawn from any partial, or one-sided view; and that it was honestly and justly rendered.

But what has it revealed as to

the real disposition of the sacerdotalists?

The organs of the party teem with letters proposing every sort of evasion. Lord Halifax, the President of the English Church Union, advises all laymen to follow and uphold their Priests; this is exactly what the Priests want. Of the Priests themselves, some flatly refuse to obey anybody but a Provincial Synod, which is a palpable make-shift; others have proposed to keep the letter of the law, and use the lights and incense before the actual commencement of the Communion office; others disregard the archbishop's judgment, if they belong to any other than the Canterbury diocese, arguing that as there cannot be two Bishops in a diocese, they are bound only by the ruling of their own Diocesan; others postpone obedience until the priestly body has signified what it will do; and so

on. But straightforward, honest men stand aghast to see the tortuousness and disingenuousness of these men who professionally lead the people to follow Him "in whose mouth there was found no guile."

To watch their sinuous movements, to have their own way and to avoid being restrained, is to see that their minds have lost their sincerity and by long dealing with adjustments, they have become morally deficient in the sense of Truth.

Wherever sacerdotalism is encouraged, this indifference to sterling truth is evident. There lies before me an office for the Requiem Celebrations of the Guild of all souls; an office for which there is no semblance of sanction in the Book of Common Prayer. The compiler has printed on the cover, "Let us pray for the WHOLE state of Christ's Church." To a mind sensitive of Truth, this

is worse than a lie, it is a slander; for it adroitly uses a mutilated expression of the Prayer Book, to gain its sufferance for a prohibited office.

The reformers took care that the reference to the Blessed dead, in the prayer to follow, should have no possible connection with the doctrine of Purgatory and escape therefrom either by Masses or Indulgences; they therefore bid the Priest to say "Let us pray for the whole state of Christ's Church *militant here in earth.*" And yet this high church Priest does not appear to have recognized the false witness he bears.

The Roman doctrine of Purgatory has had not a little share in rendering the mind of the Roman Priests insentient to truth. For if any priest actually believed, that, by his saying a Mass, he could save the soul of the most insignificant believer a

single hour's torment in actual fire, a fearful and horrible pain! he would be an inhuman monster, if he ever left the altar and did not live and die saying masses.

That any kind-hearted priest does live away from his altar is the clearest proof that what he professes to believe, he really does not believe; and no man can divorce his professed belief from his practice and maintain a pure mind, a mind sensitive to truth.

So with men who are cherishing opinions which are illicit and who are constantly endeavoring to coerce them to become allowable. Such men have their minds finally so warped that it becomes difficult for them to perceive Truth.

To avoid this web of deceitfulness, and live the truth, let the Word of God, the sole and only repository of divine truth, be more carefully and honestly

studied, let the clergy give more heed to "the Ministry of the Word," and eschew every temptation toward a mechanical way of salvation; let them remember that it is "by the foolishness of preaching" it pleases God to "save some" and that "neither is circumcision anything nor uncircumcision but a *new creature.* And as many as shall walk by this rule, peace be upon them and mercy, and upon the Israel of God."

GTU Library
2400 Ridge Road
Berkeley, CA 94709
For renewals call (510) 649-2500

All items are subject to recall.

GTU Library
3 2400 00286 0900

DATE DUE